

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 BONN 03348 01 OF 03 271839Z

42

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SAJ-01 IO-11 ACDA-05 CIAE-00 DODE-00

PM-04 H-02 INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 PRS-01

SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 /076 W
----- 042861

R 271813Z FEB 76

FM AMEMBASSY BONN

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6811

INFO USMISSION USBERLIN

AMEMBASSY BERLIN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY PARIS

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 03 BONN 03348

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR PGOV EEC WB GW US UK FR

SUBJECT: BERLIN AND DIRECT ELECTIONS TO THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT

REFS: (A) USBER 364; (B) USEC 1675; (C) BONN 2774

BEGIN SUMMARY. THE UK HAS GIVEN PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO THE FRG PROPOSAL THAT BERLIN DEPUTIES TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT BE CHOSEN BY THE BERLIN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. LONDON HAS ASKED, HOWEVER, WHETHER IT MIGHT NOT BE PREFERABLE TO SET OUT THE SPECIAL BERLIN REQUIREMENTS IN A PROTOCOL TO THE EC CONVENTION ON DIRECT ELECTIONS, RATHER THAN IN A UNILATERAL FRG DECLARATION. FRG BONN GROUP REPS EXPRESSED DISAGREEMENT WITH THE SUGGESTION AND WITH SEVERAL BRITISH PROPOSALS FOR TEXTUAL CHANGES IN THE FRG DECLARATION. ALLIED REPS, MEANWHILE, HAVE DISCUSSED THE DESIRABILITY OF MAKING A GENERAL RESERVATION, WHEN EXTENSION OF THE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 BONN 03348 01 OF 03 271839Z

NEW EC CONVENTION TO BERLIN IS APPROVED, WHICH WOULD

LEAVE OPEN THE POSSIBILITY OF FURTHER RESTRICTIONS ON VOTING RIGHTS OF BERLINERS OR ON APPLICATION OF EUROPEAN LEGISLATION TO BERLIN. ACTION REQUESTED: DEPARTMENT'S REACTION TO THE FRG DRAFT DECLARATION. END SUMMARY.

1. UK REP (HITCH) REPORTED LONDON'S INITIAL REACTIONS TO FRG DRAFT DECLARATION (PARA 5, REF C) AT FEBRUARY 24 BONN GROUP MEETING. HITCH STRESSED THAT, WHILE THERE WAS AS YET NO ENDORSEMENT OF THE POSITION AT MINISTERIAL LEVEL IN THE UK, LONDON WELCOMED THE GENERAL LINE THE FRG WAS PROPOSING -- I.E., SELECTION OF BERLINERS FOR THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT BY THE BERLIN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

2. NOTING THAT THIS WAS NOT THE USUAL CASE OF EXTENDING A TREATY TO BERLIN BUT IN FACT THE CREATION OF A DEROGATION FROM THE TREATY FOR BERLIN, HITCH SAID LONDON WONDERED WHETHER THE SPECIAL REGIME FOR BERLIN SHOULD NOT BE INCORPORATED IN A SEPARATE PROTOCOL TO THE EC CONVENTION ON DIRECT ELECTIONS. BRITISH LEGAL EXPERTS IN BRUSSELS THOUGHT A PROTOCOL WOULD HAVE TWO ADVANTAGES OVER THE DECLARATION AS PROPOSED BY THE FRG: IT WOULD MAKE THE BERLIN SITUATION MORE "WATERTIGHT" VIS-A-VIS THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE, AND IT WOULD MAKE IT PRESENTATIONALLY STRONGER VIS-A-VIS THE USSR.

3. HITCH ALSO SAID LONDON HAD FOUR COMMENTS WITH REGARD TO THE LANGUAGE OF THE FRG DRAFT:

A. THE UK THOUGHT THERE MIGHT BE ADVANTAGES IN REFERRING TO THE BERLINERS AS BEING "DESIGNATED" RATHER THAN "ELECTED" ("GEWAEHLT" IN THE FRG DRAFT). "DESIGNATED" WAS THE TERM USED IN THE MAY 12, 1949, LETTER FROM THE MILITARY GOVERNORS CONCERNING THE SENDING OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM BERLIN TO THE BUNDESTAG, AND THIS WOULD SEEM TO BE THE BEST PRECEDENT TO FOLLOW.

B. LONDON THOUGHT IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE TO AVOID DESCRIBING THE BERLINERS AS BEING FROM AMONG THOSE APPORTIONED TO THE FRG, THINKING IT WOULD BE UNDULY CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 BONN 03348 01 OF 03 271839Z

PROVOCATIVE TO THE SOVIETS TO DRAW ATTENTION TO THAT FACT.

C. THE UK HAD TRANSLATED THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF THE FRG DRAFT AS "WITH REGARD TO" ALLIED RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES ("MIT RUECKSICHT AUF," IN THE FRG TEXT). LONDON THOUGHT THE PARAGRAPH SHOULD BEGIN WITH "SUBJECT TO" ALLIED RIGHTS AND

RESPONSIBILITIES.

D. HITCH ASKED WHETHER THE GERMANS WOULD CONSIDER
USING "BERLIN (WEST)" INSTEAD OF "LAND BERLIN," TO
"AVOID UNNECESSARY TRUOUBLE."

4. FRG REPS THEN COMMENTED AT SOME LENGTH ON THE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 BONN 03348 02 OF 03 271830Z

42

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SAI-01 IO-11 ACDA-05 CIAE-00 DODE-00

PM-04 H-02 INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 PRS-01

SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 /076 W

----- 042655

R 271813Z FEB 76

FM AMEMBASSY BONN

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6812

INFO USMISSION USBERLIN

AMEMBASSY BERLIN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY PARIS

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 03 BONN 03348

BRITISH REACTION, STRESSING THAT THEIR REMARKS WERE VERY
PRELIMINARY AND STRICTLY PERSONAL. THEY DISAGREED WITH
THE IDEA OF A PROTOCOL CONCERNING BERLIN, AS THAT
WOULD HAVE TO BE NEGOTIATED WITH THE OTHER MEMBERS OF
THE EC. THE FRG HAD ALWAYS AVOIDED TAKING BERLIN
PROBLEMS TO THE EC AND THOUGHT THEY SHOULD BE DEALT WITH
IN THE BONN GROUP.

5. HENZE ALSO ASKED HITCH TO CLARIFY THE REFERENCE TO

MAKING THE BERLIN DECLARATION MORE "WATERTIGHT," AND HITCH SAID THE UK LEGAL ADVISOR IN BRUSSELS HAD MENTIONED TWO HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLES. AN AGGRIEVED VOTER IN BERLIN, HE HAD SUGGESTED, MIGHT CONCEIVABLY BE SUCCESSFUL IN A CASE BEFORE THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE IN WHICH HE CLAIMED THAT ARTICLE I OF THE DIRECT ELECTIONS CONVENTION COMMITTED THE FRG, THE UK AND FRENCH TO HOLDING DIRECT ELECTIONS IN BERLIN. THERE WAS ALSO A CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 BONN 03348 02 OF 03 271830Z

QUESTION OF WHETHER THE WORDING IN ARTICLE II AND ELSEWHERE IN THE TREATY, ON ELECTIONS "IN EACH MEMBER STATE," COULD GIVE RISE TO LITIGATION ON WHETHER BERLIN WAS OR WAS NOT PART OF THE FRG. IF ALL NINE HAD SIGNED THE PROTOCOL, SUCH LITIGATION COULD BE AVOIDED. HITCH CONFIRMED, HOWEVER, IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION, THAT LONDON DID NOT RULE OUT THE POSSIBILITY OF EXPRESSING THE BERLIN RESERVATION THROUGH AN FRG DECLARATION; IT SIMPLY THOUGHT A PROTOCOL WOULD DO THE JOB BETTER.

6. MEICHSNER (BERLIN REPRESENTATION) PICKED UP HITCH'S REFERENCE TO PRESENTATIONAL ASPECTS VIS-A-VIS THE SOVIETS AND SAID IT WOULD SEEM PREFERABLE TO FOLLOW NORMAL FORMS AS CLOSELY AS POSSIBLE. A BERLIN DECLARATION WOULD BE MORE IN KEEPING WITH ESTABLISHED PROCEDURES, WHEREAS A PROTOCOL ON BERLIN WOULD BE SOMETHING NEW.

7. AS FOR "DESIGNATED" VERSUS "ELECTED," HENZE SAID THE LATTER HAD BEEN CHOSEN BECAUSE THAT WORD WAS USED IN THE FEDERAL ELECTION LAW WITH REGARD TO BERLIN REPRESENTATIVES IN THE BUNDESTAG. THAT SEEMED THE SAFEST PRECEDENT TO FOLLOW, AND THE FRG WOULD PREFER TO KEEP THE WORD "ELECTED." MEICHSNER ADDED THAT THE ALLIES, SUBSEQUENT TO THE 1949 LETTER, HAD APPROVED THE TERM "ELECTED" IN AUTHORIZING TAKE-OVER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION LAW IN BERLIN. HE NOTED ALSO THAT "GEWAEHLT" MEANS NOT ONLY "ELECTED" BUT "CHOSEN."

8. AS FOR DESCRIBING THE BERLINERS AS BEING FROM AMONG THOSE APPORTIONED TO THE FRG, HENZE SAID THAT THE BERLIN DEPUTIES ARE INCLUDED IN THE OVER-ALL NUMBER OF FRG MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THAT THE WORDING OF THE FRG DRAFT WAS ACCURATE. TO THIS, DUISBERG (FONOFF LEGAL SECTION) ADDED THAT NEITHER THE FRG NOR THE ALLIES HAD ANY INTEREST IN IMPLYING THAT THE MEMBERS FROM BERLIN CONSTITUTED A SEPARATE REPRESENTATION, OR THAT THERE WAS A SPECIAL BERLIN CONTINGENT IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT. BERLIN WAS NOT A MEMBER OF THE EC.

9. FRG REPS SUGGESTED THAT "WITH REGARD TO" WAS
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 BONN 03348 02 OF 03 271830Z

PERHAPS NOT AN ACCURATE TRANSLATION OF "MIT RUECKSICHT
AUF." IN ANY CASE, THEY THOUGHT THAT "SUBJECT TO"
WOULD NOT BE AN ACCURATE EXPRESSION. THE SECOND
PARAGRAPH OF THE FRG DRAFT WAS MEANT TO SET FORTH ALL
OF THE CONDITIONS OF A SEPARATE REGIME FOR BERLIN.
"SUBJECT TO" WOULD IMPLY THAT UNSPECIFIED
ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS MIGHT APPLY.

10. FINALLY, FRG REPS NOTED THAT "BERLIN (WEST)" HAD
NEVER BEEN USED IN TREATIES AND THAT TO CHANGE FROM
"LAND BERLIN" WOULD INVOLVE A MAJOR POLICY CHANGE
FOR THE FRG.

11. BOTH US AND FRENCH REPS SAID THEY HAD NO REACTIONS
TO REPORT FROM CAPITALS AS YET. LATTER SAID HE COULD,
HOWEVER, STATE THAT PARIS WOULD AGREE WITH THE FRG'S
OBJECTION TO "BERLIN (WEST)," ALBEIT FOR DIFFERENT
REASONS.

12. IN COMMENTING ON UK PRESENTATION, US REP SAID THE
QUESTION OF WHETHER THE BERLIN RESTRICTIONS WERE TO BE
SPELLED OUT IN A DECLARATION BY THE FRG OR IN A PROTOCOL
WAS ESSENTIALLY AN INTERNAL ONE FOR EC MEMBERS, THOUGH
HE ASSUMED THE FRG WOULD IN EITHER CASE HAVE TO OBTAIN

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 BONN 03348 03 OF 03 271836Z

42
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SAJ-01 IO-11 ACDA-05 CIAE-00 DODE-00

PM-04 H-02 INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 PRS-01

SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 /076 W

----- 042792

R 271813Z FEB 76
FM AMEMBASSY BONN
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6813
INFO USMISSION USBERLIN
AMEMBASSY BERLIN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
AMEMBASSY PARIS
USMISSION EC BRUSSELS
USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 03 OF 03 BONN 03348

THE CONSENT OF THE OTHER EIGHT TO A SEPARATE
SYSTEM FOR BERLIN. HENZE ACKNOWLEDGED THIS TO BE TRUE,
BUT SAID THE PRECISE WORDING OF A PROTOCOL WOULD HAVE
TO BE NEGOTIATED WITH THE OTHER EIGHT, WHEREAS THE
WORDING OF AN FRG DECLARATION WOULD NOT.

13. US REP ALSO ADDED THAT, BEFORE REACTING TO THE FRG
DRAFT DECLARATION, THE US WOULD WISH TO GIVE MORE STUDY
TO THE BROADER QUESTION OF WHETHER ANY OTHER
RESERVATIONS WOULD BE REQUIRED. HENZE RECALLED THAT
GEHLHOFF HAD EMPHASIZED TO THE THREE ALLIED AMBASSADORS
THE PREVIOUS DAY (BONN 3008) THAT IT WOULD BE VERY
DIFFICULT FOR THE FRG TO CONSIDER A SYSTEM IN WHICH
BERLIN MEMBERS WOULD HAVE A DIFFERENT STATUS OR MORE
LIMITED RIGHTS IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT THAN THEY
NOW HAVE.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 BONN 03348 03 OF 03 271836Z

14. US REP ALSO SAID HE THOUGHT DEPARTMENT, WHEN IT
REACTED TO FRG DRAFT, WOULD PLACE LESS EMPHASIS THAN
HAD LONDON ON THE SOVIET FACTOR. HE THOUGHT IT CERTAIN
THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD PROTEST NO MATTER WHAT ACTION WAS
TAKEN BY THE FRG AND THE ALLIES, AND SAID THE BASIC
CONSIDERATION WAS WHAT WAS REQUIRED TO PRESERVE ALLIED
RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, NOT HOW TO AVOID A CON-
FRONTATION WITH THE SOVIETS.

15. COMMENT. WE TEND TO AGREE WITH USBER'S VIEWS
THAT IT WOULD BE BOTH DIFFICULT AND PREMATURE TO ATTEMPT
TO SPELL OUT AT THIS TIME PRECISE RESTRICTIONS ON VOTING
RIGHTS OF BERLINERS. ON THE OTHER HAND, GIVEN THE
GROWING ASSUMPTION THAT BERLINERS WILL CONTINUE TO BE
EQUAL TO ALL OTHER DEPUTIES IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

(PARA 4, REF A), WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE A MISTAKE NOT TO GIVE WARNING THAT SOME RESTRICTIONS MIGHT HAVE TO BE IMPOSED AT A LATER DATE, AT LEAST WITH RESPECT TO INCREASED POWERS OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND POSSIBLY WITH REGARD TO VOTING RIGHTS. FAILURE TO DO SO WOULD TEND TO CONFIRM THE PRESENT ASSUMPTION OF THE GERMANS AND COMPLICATE FUTURE RESTRICTIVE ACTION.

16. IN A TRIPARTITE DISCUSSION ON FEBRUARY 23, ALLIED REPS CONSIDERED THE DESIRABILITY OF AN OVER-ALL RESERVATION WHICH WOULD LEAVE OPEN THE POSSIBILITY OF A SUBSEQUENT RESTRICTION, AND THE FRENCH REP IS TRYING HIS HAND AT A DRAFT. USBER'S DRAFT IN PARA 6, REFTEL, WOULD SEEM TO BE AIMED IN THAT SAME DIRECTION.

17. WE HAD NOT EXPECTED THE UK REP TO SEEK INSTRUCTIONS SO QUICKLY, BUT NOW THAT THOSE INSTRUCTIONS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED AND REPORTED WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO THE CONSULTATIVE PROCESS ALSO TO HAVE THE DEPARTMENT'S EARLY REACTION TO THE BASIC PRINCIPLE REFLECTED IN THE FRG DRAFT -- I.E., THAT BERLIN DEPUTIES WILL BE ELECTED BY THE BERLIN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. AS INDICATED IN REF (C) WE BELIEVE THE BASIC PRINCIPLE IS SOUND AND PROBABLY THE MOST LOGICAL PROCEDURE TO ADOPT, AND WE THEREFORE RECOMMEND THAT
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 BONN 03348 03 OF 03 271836Z

THE DEPARTMENT CONCUR.

18. ACTION REQUESTED: DEPARTMENT'S GUIDANCE ON THE FRG DRAFT.
HILLENBRAND.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AGREEMENT DRAFT, POLICIES, BERLIN QUADRIpartite MATTERS, ELECTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 27 FEB 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ShawDG
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976BONN03348
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760074-1047
From: BONN
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t1976027/aaaaafbe.tel
Line Count: 368
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 76 BONN 2774
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ShawDG
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 31 MAR 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <31 MAR 2004 by ElyME>; APPROVED <29 JUL 2004 by ShawDG>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: BERLIN AND DIRECT ELECTIONS TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
TAGS: PFOR, PGOV, WB, GE, US, UK, FR, EEC
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006